

Second Cut Annotated Outline  
For  
“Examination of Public Response to  
Preliminary Guides: What Can the FS  
Learn From IT?”



**INTASA**

1030 CURTIS STREET • MENLO PARK, CALIFORNIA 94025 • (415) 323-9011

IRP 77-03

March 1978

INTERIM REPORT NO. 2

SECOND CUT ANNOTATED OUTLINE

FOR

"EXAMINATION OF PUBLIC RESPONSE TO  
PRELIMINARY AREA PLANNING GUIDES:  
WHAT CAN THE FS LEARN FROM IT?"

Submitted to:

U.S. Forest Service  
Region 2  
Lakewood, Colorado

LIBRARY

JUN 12 1978

ROCKY MOUNTAIN STATION

## Chapter 1

### OVERVIEW OF PUBLIC RESPONSE: AN OBJECTIVE INTERPRETATION

#### A. Summary of Public Involvement Strategy

- . What process followed?
- . Who contacted and why?
- . Did overlap between RARE II - AG workshops bias response?
- . What limitations on response form by OMB?

#### B. Statistical Review of Public Response

- . What affiliation did respondents note?
- . Did response represent out-of-region interests?
- . How many individuals responded?
- . What is response by category and by Area?
- . Can the comments received be counted as votes?

#### C. Cross Section of Geographic Specific Response

- . Is there a correlation between response and place of residence (i.e., SRU)?
- . Does rapid change/growth drive the response?
- . What are concerns in SRU's Q (CRMA), H (SRMA) and R (GPA)?
- . Does AG plan validate/invalidate these concerns?

#### D. New Issues Suggested by Respondents

## I. Overview of Public Response: An Objective Interpretation

### A. Summary of Public Involvement Strategy

Objective: To outline the process followed in exchanging ideas with the public, the types of "publics" contacted, the time and place of AG-RARE II workshops, and the limitations of the response form in terms of abstracting statistically significant information.

- . Figure 1.1 -- Display of types of public queried, type of exchange initiated during AG development, and format for exchange (Gary Severson is sending information to design this figure).
- . Text -- Brief discussion of process followed by FS in identifying and selecting issues.
- . Table I-1 -- Tabular display of workshops with "general public": (1) date, time and place of workshops, (2) number of Area Guides disseminated by area.
- . Text -- Discussion of overlap between AG workshops and RARE II workshops. Draw conclusion that overlap may have tended to bias the response toward polarized positions (i.e. re: wilderness as an issue and as a key value).
- . Text -- Description of response form and OMB regulations. Draw conclusion that statistical analysis of "votes" or preferences is out of the question given the format of the response form.

### B. Statistical Review of Public Response

Objective: To present a summary of computer data as this was tabulated on a first run, to show the range of geographic responses (i.e. by states), and to indicate the degree of polarization in opinion.

- . Text: 20,000 AGs distributed; 1024 comment sheets received; represents response from about 900 individuals. Received after deadline: 111 responses.
- . Figure 1.2 -- Bargraph depicting respondent affiliation by area.
- . Table I-2 -- Tabular display of respondent residence by state.

- . Text: Each response form was counted as one response;  
i.e. when form purported to speak for a larger group,  
it was counted for computational purposes as one response.
- . Tables I-3, I-4, I-5 and I-6 summarizing computer data  
(sample tables included as part of this outline -- numbers  
to be revised based on complete and updated summary from  
G. Severson).
- . Text -- Brief description of process followed in coding data  
from response forms. Draw conclusion that due to nature of  
response forms (i.e. open ended and following outline of AG)  
the numbers shown may not accurately reflect depth of feeling  
on contents (e.g. wilderness) or polarization of opinion.  
Also qualify tables by restating that comments should not be  
perceived as votes.
- . Text (may or may not be used) -- List of quotes showing  
polarization of opinion on issues. E.G. remove all grazing  
from public lands vs. consider grazing a key value.

Table I-3

CENTRAL ROCKY MOUNTAIN AREA: SUMMARY OF 220 RESPONSES		
	Number of Comments <sup>1)</sup>	Outcome
Issues	50	General concurrence expressed
Current Situation	86	2 to 1 favor modifying current situation; evenly split on increasing/decreasing quantitative estimates shown
Goals	28	General concurrence expressed
Objectives	17	General concurrence expressed
Resource Outputs	14	1.8 to 1 concur with outputs given
Key Values <sup>2)</sup>	54	2 to 1 favor deleting
Key Values Comments <sup>3)</sup>	130	Total suggestions for modifying key values

Notes:

- 2) Key values in Area Planning Guides include: recreation, wildlife, scenery, wilderness.
- 3) Additional key values suggested include: grazing/range, minerals/energy fuels, timber management, maintain multiple use management, consider local economies, archeology, water, agriculture.
- 1) There is not necessarily a one-to-one correlation between number of individuals responding and number of comments due to multiple comments on particular response forms.

EXAMPLE

Table I-3

CENTRAL ROCKY MOUNTAIN AREA: SUMMARY OF 220 RESPONSES		
	<u>Number of Comments</u> <sup>1)</sup>	<u>Outcome</u>
Issues	50	General concurrence expressed
Current Situation	86	2 to 1 favor modifying current situation; evenly split on increasing/decreasing quantitative estimates shown
Goals	28	General concurrence expressed
Objectives	17	General concurrence expressed
Resource Outputs	14	1.8 to 1 concur with outputs given
Key Values <sup>2)</sup>	54	2 to 1 favor deleting
Key Values Comments <sup>3)</sup>	130	Total suggestions for modifying key values

Notes:

- 2) Key values in Area Planning Guides include: recreation, wildlife, scenery, wilderness.
- 3) Additional key values suggested include: grazing/range, minerals/energy fuels, timber management, maintain multiple use management, consider local economies, archeology, water, agriculture.
- 1) There is not necessarily a one-to-one correlation between number of individuals responding and number of comments due to multiple comments on particular response forms.

EXAMPLETable I-4

GREAT PLAINS AREA: SUMMARY OF 276 RESPONSES		
	<u>Number of Comments</u> <sup>1)</sup>	<u>Outcome</u>
Issues <sup>2)</sup>	269	5 to 1 in favor of adding issues
Current Situation	64	1.5 to 1 concur with depiction of current situation
Goals	61	General concurrence expressed
Objectives	41	General concurrence expressed
Resource Outputs	16	Equal number favor increasing/decreasing
Key Values <sup>3)</sup>	23	1.5 to 1 concur
Comments on Key Values <sup>4)</sup>	187	Total suggestions for modifying key values

Notes:

- 2) Issue adds include: Wilderness, tree management, recreation, roads, archeology, minerals/energy fuels, water, threatened or endangered species, key values, non-game species wildlife, off-road motorized recreation, grazing and wildlife conflicts, dispersed recreation, cooperation with government agencies.
- 3) Key values in Area Planning Guide include: wildlife, range, recreation/wilderness, water.
- 4) Additional key values suggested include: grazing/range, minerals/energy fuels, timber management, maintain multiple use management, consider local economies, archeology, water, agriculture.
- 1) There is not necessarily a one-to-one correlation between number of individuals responding and number of comments due to multiple comments on particular response forms.



Table I-5

SOUTHERN ROCKY MOUNTAIN AREA: SUMMARY OF 516 RESPONSES		
	<u>Number of<sup>1)</sup> Comments</u>	<u>Outcome</u>
Issues	997	6 to 1 in favor of modifying
Current Situation	481	7 to 1 favor some modification
Goals <sup>2)</sup>	409	3 to 1 favor adding goals
Objectives <sup>3)</sup>	158	4 to 1 favor adding objectives
Resource Outputs	161	2 to 1 favor modifying outputs; evenly split on increasing/ decreasing
Key Values <sup>4)</sup>	198	5.6 to 1 favor deleting key values
Key Values Comments <sup>5)</sup>	608	Total suggestions for additional key values

Notes:

- 1) Values may add to more than total number of respondents due to multiple responses.
- 2) Additional goals suggested include: fire management, cooperation with government agencies, threatened/endangered species, wilderness on grasslands, minerals/energy fuels, water quality, access to National Forest lands, water utilization, mineral parks, law enforcement, cooperation with landowners, reclamation of mine areas, cooperation with permittees.
- 3) Additional objectives include: range management, off-road motorized recreation, fire management, wildlife/agriculture management, adherence to Organic Act, full use of existing facilities, cooperation with groups and organizations, improved sanitation, reforestation, private enterprise development, research.
- 4) Key values considered in Area Planning Guide include: recreation, wildlife, scenery, wilderness.
- 5) Additional key values suggested include: grazing/range, minerals/energy fuels, timber, maintain multiple use, consider local economies, archeology, water, agriculture.

Table I-6

PRELIMINARY AREA GUIDES FOR REGION 2:  
SUMMARY OF 1024 GENERAL COMMENTS

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Number of Comments</u>	<u>Percent of Total</u>	<u>Outcome</u>
Maps, Photos, Drawings	42	4%	?
Charts, Graphs, Tables	100	10%	?
Format	44	4%	?
Writing	190	19%	?
Units of Measurement	46	4%	?
Partial Rejection/Acceptance of Preliminary Area Guides	123	12%	3 to 1 partially reject
Total Rejection/Acceptance of Preliminary Area Guides	145	14%	1.6 to 1 totally reject
Other Government Agencies	70	7%	More cooperation urged
Public Involvement	70	7%	Not enough perceived

NOTE: ? to be resolved by new data from G.S.

### C. Cross Section of Geographic-Specific Response

Objective: To display the key issues and goals of concern by SRU in order to capture the range of geographic-specific attitudes, to describe one SRU for each Area where the pressures of growth are creating a rapidly changing living environment, to display how issues/goals would arise by virtue of changing socio-economic conditions thereby necessitating nontraditional response from the FS.

- . Figure 1.3 -- Map (or maps) of 3 Areas, decomposed by SRU, and displaying for each SRU the predominant "issue add" (or adds) and goal. Data to be prepared by G. Severson.
- . Text -- If it turns out that a significant amount of response was received from particular SRUs, discuss why the response is so heavy (e.g., use of CB to rally workshop participants, marginal local economy, impact of rapid growth, etc.)
- . Tables I-7, I-8, I-9 -- Tableaus similar to sample Table I-7 depicting for SRU's H (SRMA), Q (CRMA) and R (GPA) the following: (1) socio-economic conditions, (2) factors of change/stability, (3) representative issues of specific concern, (4) FS activities as implied by Preliminary AGs. Tableaus to be derived from FUND final drafts, response forms (identified by computer run), and information extracted from AGs.

### D. New Issues Suggested by Respondents

Objective: To summarize the issue adds by Area and to display how data was manipulated to more accurately reflect issues of concern.

- . Table I-10 -- Sample table provided in outline. Values shown to be revised based on a hand count of issue adds as reflected in cut-and-paste comment sheets to be provided by G. Severson.
- . Text -- Describe process for more accurately capturing the nature of the comments by changing responses from categories in initial computer run into different categories during cut-and-paste procedure. Note that while the procedure was subjective, FS believed that it would refine the response in order to gain additional perception.

SAMPLE

EXAMPLE OF GEOGRAPHIC-SPECIFIC RESPONSE  
IN THE GREAT PLAINS AREA

Social Resource Unit:

Geographic Boundaries:

Socioeconomic Indicators:

- Ag./Non-Ag. Emp.
- Poverty Level
- Unemployment Rate
- Growth Rate
- Wage Structure
- Land and Housing Cost

Factors of Change or Stability

- Energy Development
- Marginal Timber
- Etc.

Representative Issues of Specific Concern

- "Local people don't want more wilderness. . ."
- ". . .grasslands need management"
- etc.

Forest Service Management Sphere

- 3% of total forest
- 10% of range
- etc.

Other Agencies Involved: USGS, BLM, etc.

Idea:

Use overlay  
of map of  
SRU over  
tableau

Production: Reduce 2-page  
Table to fit on one sheet  
or use foldout

IDEA: Use overlay of  
map of SRU over tableau

Table I-7

SAMPLE

EXAMPLE OF LOCAL RESPONSE TO PRELIMINARY  
GREAT PLAINS AREA PLANNING GUIDE

Social Resource Unit: Q

Geographic Boundaries: Black Hills and Pine Ridge to the east; Laramie Mountains to south; Big Horn Mountains to west. State of Wyoming.

Principal Cities: Sheridan, Gillette, Casper, Buffalo, Douglas

Socioeconomic Indicators:

- Employment: In transition from primarily agricultural employment base. Ratio of agriculture to nonagriculture employment was 1:45 in 1970 and 1:8 in 1975; in the Natrona District ratio was 1:35.
- Economic Base: Beef-cattle and sheep-wool production, irrigated farming, recreation, oil and gas production, coal mining, uranium mines and mills, bentonite mining.
- Unemployment/Poverty: 3.8% unemployment; 9.2% poverty reflecting older people on fixed incomes.
- Growth Rate: 121% between 1960-1970; level off to 1975; Sheridan and Douglas currently experiencing rapid growth.
- Land & Housing Costs: 200-500% increase over 10-year period in Gillette, Sheridan, Casper and Buffalo due to energy developments.
- Wage Structure: \$2.10 to \$4 -- agriculture and recreation; \$4 to \$8 -- semi-industrial; \$8+ -- industrial.

Portents for Change/Stability

- Widely dispersed energy development has seriously disrupted traditional life style and threatens existing agriculture economic base.
- Increasing local populations are creating a significant demand for improved access to NF lands, for winter sports, and motorized recreational activities; the lands in the Black Hills, Big Horn Mountains, and Medicine Bow National Forest are in danger of being destroyed by over use.
- Planned increases in demands for water to meet irrigation needs, domestic and industrial requirements, and energy developments cannot be met with existing supply.

(continued)

Table I-7 (Cont.)

Concerns Expressed in Response to Preliminary GP Area Guide

- Economic viability of local ranching, timber, hunting and fishing industries threatened.
- Loss of multiple use of National Forests due to wilderness designations undesirable.
- Key values threaten multiple use management practices.
- Severe conflict between recreation and livestock foreseen.
- Reduced access to National Forest lands due to road closures undesirable.
- Development of energy and nonenergy minerals impeded by wilderness designation, road closures, and key value concept.
- Inadequate protection for hunting and fishing opportunities.
- Inadequate protection from snow mobiles and other motorized use; not enough opportunities for motorized recreation.

Data from Preliminary Area Guide Related to Response

- Range: Increase AUMs by 49,400 or 24% more than existing.
- Timber: Increase annual output of wood products by 2,172,900 cubic feet or 400%.
- Wilderness: Designate 222,800 acres as wilderness or 32% of inventoried wilderness acres in Big Horn National Forest
- Non-motor recreation on lands with roads closed: expected to increase from 32,000 RVD in 1985 to 106,600 RVD in 2020.
- Wildlife and Fish: intensive treatment of 63,800 acres planned by 1985 and increasing to 390,200 by 2020.
- Motorized Recreation (Driving for Pleasure and others): provide for 575,500 RVD by 1985, increasing to 1,150,900 RVD by 2020.

EXAMPLE

Table I-10

NEW ISSUES RAISED BY RESPONDENTS IN  
GPA, SRMA AND CRMA AREAS

<div>By Area</div> <div>Concern</div>	<u>GPA</u>	<u>CRMA</u>	<u>SRMA</u>
• Maintenance of Multiple Use	20%	25%	35%
• Inclusion of Grazing/Range as Key Value	10%	6%	20%
• Addition of Minerals/Energy Fuels in FS Program	4%	9%	17%
• Inclusion of Timber Mgt. as Key Value	12%	6%	16%
• Consider Local Economies	10%	7%	16%
• Reexamine Wilderness Allocation	25%		43%

## Chapter II

### PUBLIC RESPONSE IN PERSPECTIVE: A SUBJECTIVE INTERPRETATION

#### A. Public Reaction to Preliminary Area Guides

- . Did some people feel threatened and perhaps misinterpret FS intent?
- . Did some people consider AGs as a fait accompli?
- . Did some people exhibit mistrust of the FS as a manager of public resources?
- . Did some people indicate that the Forest Service does not know what is in the public interest?
- . Are all facts known to all involved?
- . Does the public understand the FS mandate (i.e., re: wilderness and energy)?
- . Does the public understand the relation between RARE II and Land Management Planning?

#### B. Public Reaction in Juxtaposition to Area Guide Contents

- . Based on AG contents, are some concerns real?
- . Based on AG contents, are some concerns artificial?



## II. Public Response In Perspective: A Subjective Interpretation

### A. Public Reaction to Preliminary Area Guides

Objective: To discuss misinterpretations of the intent of Area Guides, to display the volume of response to the key value concept, and to clear up misconceptions about the FS mandate. (In the first case emphasis will be on showing qualitatively that some people, for whatever reason, did not capture the meaning of plans presented in the AGs. In the second case, emphasis will be on showing quantitatively that key values and multiple use are the primary topics of misinterpretation. In the third case, emphasis will be on describing what the FS is/is not responsible for.)

- . Text: Discussion of three questions with example quotes taken from response forms (emphasis on qualitative indicators).

(1) Did some people feel threatened and perhaps misinterpret the FS intent? Indicators that the answer is yes include: (1) respondents who felt that local economies are being abandoned, (2) respondents who felt that consumptive use of resources (i.e. timber, grazing) was being abandoned.

(2) Did some people consider the AGs as a fait accompli? Indicators that the answer is yes include: (1) people who felt that AGs are the "new bible" and that the FS is abandoning MU management, (2) people who felt that ranges given for wilderness recommendations are precise rather than interim measures based on yet to be completed evaluation of RARE II inventory.

(3) Did some respondents exhibit mistrust of the FS as a manager of public resources? Indicators that the answer is yes are: (1) livestock producers who think the FS is running them out of business, (2) respondents who do not feel that the FS is facing the motorized recreation issue head on, (3) people who think FS has "sold out" to the environmentalists.

Note: The above is subject to modification upon receipt of the summary of in-house analysis results to be sent by G.S.

- . Text: Discussion of two questions with emphasis on quantitative backup.

(1) Did some people indicate that they think the FS does not know what is in the public interest? Indicator that the answer is yes is shown in Table II-1.

Table II-1

NUMBER OF COMMENTS REGARDING  
ADD OR MODIFY KEY VALUES

Area	Comments Re: Add Key Values	Comments Re: Modify Key Values	Total Comments
CRMA	?	?	130 <sup>1)</sup>
GPA	?	?	187 <sup>2)</sup>
SRMA	?	?	608 <sup>3)</sup>

1) Total # of respondents: 220

2) Total # of respondents: 276

3) Total # of respondents: 516

Note: Table to be completed upon receipt of updated computer summary and comment sheets from G.S.

(2) Are all facts known to all involved? Indicator that answer is no is number of people who felt that multiple use planning is being replaced by key values. See Table II-2.

Table II-2

Area <sup>1)</sup>	Number of Comments re: Abandonment of MU	Number of Comments re: Maintain MU
GPA		
CRMA		
SRMA		

1) Total number of respondents provided in notes to Table II-1

Note: Table to be completed upon receipt of updated computer summary and comment sheets from G.S.

Text -- Discussion of two questions with emphasis on providing new information.

(1) Does the public have a working knowledge of the FS mandate? Indicators are respondents who did not understand what FS can/cannot do with respect to (1) energy development, (2) wilderness designations.

- . Text -- Clarify FS mandate re: energy. Use quotes from FSM. Contact Tom Sclesser for information and relevant legislation.

- . Text -- Clarify FS mandate re: wilderness. Use quotes from FSM. Contact Gary Plisco for information and relevant legislation.

(2) Does the public have a working knowledge of the on-going operations of the Agency? Indicator that the answer is no is the lack of understanding of the difference between the Area Guides and the RARE II effort.

- . Text -- indicate the time frame for finalizing AGs and the input expected from RARE II data. Explain what is the status of inventoried lands (i.e. by RARE II) at this time, the timing of the evaluation phase, the timing of the draft and final EIS.

- Use letters of 12/2/77 from Chief McGuire and 11/21/77 from RF C. Rupp as source material.  
Obtain new relevant material to supplement.

B. Public Reaction is Juxtaposition to Area Guide Contents

Objective: To display fears as expressed by the respondents, to judge whether these are real or artificial fears, and to cite the appropriate reference from the AGs.

- . Text -- Discuss the contents of Table II-3 in terms of fears being artificial in some cases, while in others they may be real. (Upon receipt of inhouse analysis summary, it may be possible to construct two tables -- one displaying real fear and one artificial). An example of a real fear is that expressed by grazing interests in resolving a grazing-recreation conflict. An example of an artificial fear is that the FS is abandoning MU management.

- . Display to be developed using sample quotes from response forms, AG quotes, and possibly a subjective interpretation of whether fear is real or artificial.

## Chapter III

### THE CRITICAL CONCERN: KEY VALUES

#### A. Overview of Responses to Key Value Concept

- . How many comments were received?
- . What was the affiliation of the respondents?
- . Is there a correlation between responses and affiliation?

#### B. Key Values as Discussed in Preliminary Area Guides

- . Do statements in the AGs create confusion?
- . Do individuals read entire passages or do they stop when a personal threat is perceived?

#### C. Key Values: What They Are/Are Not

- . Is possible misinterpretation a difficulty with semantics?
- . Are KVs biased toward environmentalists and hippies?
- . Have KVs usurped multiple use in setting resource output objectives?
- . Do KVs benefit a few at the expense of many?
- . Do KVs preclude commodity-producing uses?
- . Do KVs pit national interests against local concerns?
- . Do KVs open the Rockies to exploitation from "outsiders"?
- . Are KVs a retreat to the dominant use concept?
- . In view of the confusion, should the name be changed?

### III. The Critical Concern: Key Values

#### A. Overview of Responses to Key Value Concept

Objective: To show the volume of response received, by affiliation, in order to exhibit that it is the outstanding concern.

- . Table III-1 -- Display of breakdown of all comments by affiliation (sample table included in outline). Data on new summary sheets from G.S.
- . Figure 3.1 -- Bargraph of "no change", "modify", "delete" with regard to KV. Data to be derived from computer and from summary of content analysis to be sent by G.S.

#### B. The Concept as Discussed in the Preliminary Area Guides

Objective: To present quotations from the Guides as illustrations of where the confusion may lie.

- . Text: Use dot format with quotations such as the following:
  - "The national significance of the Central Rocky Mountain Area is recognized in this program through emphasis on key values of wildlife, recreation, scenic beauty, and wilderness." (pg. 26, CRMA)
  - "This program establishes direction for two major subareas in the Great Plains. One subarea consists of mountainous forests, alpine areas and hardwood forests; generally Social Resource Units B, J, R, U, N and parts of P. The key values for this subarea are wildlife and recreation. The second subarea consists of agricultural lands, grasslands, prairies, and shrublands; generally Social Resource Units M, O, Q, S, T, and parts of P. The key values for this subarea are wildlife and range." (pg. 37, GPA)
  - "This Program Direction strikes a balance between the national demands that thrust the Southern Rocky Mountain Area (SRMA) into the role of a "National Playground" and the more local demands for commodity products, i.e., forage and wood, which sustain local economies. The program emphasizes the key values of recreation, scenic beauty, wilderness and wildlife." (pg. 36, SRMA)
- . Text -- Discuss the observation that apparently some people did not "read on" but stopped short and reacted to key values emotionally. Use quotes such as the following to make the point the KV is not the same or replacement for multiple use.

Table III-1

OVERVIEW OF RESPONSE RE: MODIFICATION OF KEY VALUE CONCEPT  
IN ALL AREAS BY 1024 RESPONDENTS

Concerns \ Affiliation	Conservation	Recreation	Academic	Resource Industry	FS Employees	Agriculture	Government (Not FS)	Individual Citizen	Other
Grazing/Range									
Minerals/Energy									
Timber Management									
Multiple Use Mgt.									
Local Economies									
Archaeology									
Water									
Agriculture									

- "National Forests, Parks, and resource lands comprise a major portion of the Central Rocky Mountain Area. Resource Management is directed to perpetuating the capability of the land to provide scenery, recreation, wildlife, water, wood, forage, minerals and wilderness." (pg. 41, CRMA)
- "Management of the National Forests and Grasslands of the Great Plains Area is an ongoing, flexible, process based on sustaining the productivity of the land. The Great Plains represents a wide diversity of land forms, of uses, values and resources pertinent to the scenic beauty, recreation, wildlife, wilderness, water yields, livestock range, and timber of National Forest lands in America's heartlands." (pg. 54, GPA)
- "Wood supplies and forage for livestock will be provided for at current levels to sustain local dependent industries. However, some individual operations may be reduced while others are increased." (pg. 36, SRMA)

#### C. Key Values: What They Are/Are Not

Objective: To interpret the semantic implications of the words, and to draw the contrast between what people think the phrase means and what it actually means.

- . Text -- Dictionary definition (Funk & Wagnall): Key - "to solve something" as in a key to a puzzle; Value - "desirability or worth of a thing; intrinsic worth, utility".
- . Inference of the words may be "The key to planning in the Area is to understand the fundamental or basic worth of the resources and the most desired use of them" (author's subjective interpretation). The words are "loaded" and suggest that the FS has some preordained knowledge of intrinsic worth. Difficulty lies in observation that people tend to think that their preferred use of resources dictates the resources' worth.
- . Text -- Discussion of some common misinterpretations as surfaced in the public response.
- Key Values Are Biased Toward Environmentalists and Hippies. Although management activities undertaken under the KV concept are aimed in most cases at achieving a greater level of commodity outputs in the future, this point is apparently missed by those who fear that the environmentalists and backpackers have first claim on the NFS resources at the expense of local economies. Also, the fact that the FS is responding to congressional legislation such as NEPA, PL 92-500, etc. is not clear, nor is it clear that the FS must plan for a changing societal value system if indeed the land is to be "unimpaired".

- Key Values Have Usurped Multiple Use In Setting Resource Objectives. Public response indicates that people do not understand how the FS intends to use the concept. Rather than perceiving it as a management tool to be used in devising management strategies to achieve a given level of multi resource outputs, it is seen as replacing multiple use.
- Key Values Benefit the Few at the Expense of the Many. It is understandable how people might draw this inference. Statistics in the guides for wilderness use, for example, indicate that this resource is used by a relatively small percent of the population. In the guides the value of the wilderness resource in and of itself (i.e., regardless of its use) is not made clear. It is also not clear that the FS is responding to a congressional mandate. It is interesting that people are unable to identify themselves as part of the "few" (as in the Southern Rockies, for example, where the FS issues a total of 1300 grazing permits and manages developed recreation sites with a capacity of 65,500 PAOT).
- Key Values Will Preclude Commodity-Producing Uses of NFS Land. While this may be true with respect to location-specific resources, e.g. wilderness designations, it is not true of the area as a whole. However, response indicates that some see KV as locking up the public land and prohibiting production uses such as mining, timbering, etc.
- Key Values Pit National Interests Against Local Interests. It is not clear that the KVs are a way of capturing the intrinsic value of an area as this is perceived from a National point of view while concurrently managing FS resources to achieve the local economic objectives. The fact that the situation is not the public at large versus a small group of locally dependent citizens, but rather incorporating the views of the public at large in local planning, is not apparent.
- Key Values Open the Rockies to Exploitation from "Outsiders". The Rocky Mountain areas are no longer self contained. Forces such as energy development, increased social mobility, more leisure time, etc. have opened the boundaries of the Rockies to pressure from immigration or from visitors located outside of the region. The fact that KV are a means of managing public resources in view of a dynamically changing demand, while simultaneously managing to mitigate adverse environmental impacts, is not clear.



- Key Values Are a Retreat to the Dominant Use Concept. As is clear from the AGs, the respective Areas will be managed for a sustained and in some cases increased level of multi resource outputs. However, public response indicates that the words imply dominant use of resources for wilderness, scenic beauty, recreation, and wildlife.
- Multiple Use Means Every Use on Every Acre: Key Values Run Contrary to This "Fact". As the concept of multiple use has been misinterpreted to mean every use for every acre -- i.e. in contrast to first determining the relative value of certain acres for certain uses -- it is easy to see how key values as a management tool could be misinterpreted. In fact, managing for wilderness, for example, allows multiple use of those acres -- i.e. for watershed, dispersed recreation, wildlife habitat, grazing, etc.
- . Conclusion: The FS has the mandate to manage resources that belong to the public at large. At the same time, because of its unique management structure it has a long tradition of working at the local level in cooperation with the local interests. It appears that the term "key values" should be changed to reflect the dual role of FS personnel. Suggest: "Emphasis in Multiple Use Resource Management: A Regional Response to Public Values."

## Chapter IV

### KEY VALUES: A GOOD CONCEPT WITH A BAD NAME

#### A. Management Tool Which Complements Changing Public Values

- . How is the KV concept used in multiple use management?
- . How are environmental, social and economic tradeoffs used in deriving key values?
- . How does the concept respond to changing public values?
- . How does the concept take advantage of state-of-the art improvements in interdisciplinary planning?

#### B. Key Values and Multiple Use-Sustained Yield

- . How are key values and "relative values" interrelated?
- . How are key values used to simultaneously plan for local interests and those of the public at large?
- . How are key values used to manage resources that "in combination will best meet the needs of the American people"?

#### C. Application of Key Value Emphasis in Multiple Use Planning: Three Illustrations

- . What type of on-the-ground management activities does the FS intend to take that reflect key values in multiple use planning?

#### D. Implications of the Concept for Future Planning

- . Based on the above illustrations, what conclusions can be drawn?

#### IV. Key Values: A Good Concept With a Bad Name

##### A. Management Tool For Changing Public Values

- . Purpose is to provide a direction -- i.e., management objectives -- for FS managers that will guide them in their day to day activities (i.e., on the ground multiple use management of NSF resources).
- . Intent is to consider both the capabilities of the land and the desires of the public (both the public at large and the local population) in order to derive a mix of resource uses that considers economic efficiency (e.g., \$ return on \$ invested), social well being (e.g., recreation opportunities, community stability), environmental quality (e.g., water, wildlife refuge).
- . Concept is intended to be dynamic and recognizes that public values and needs change. Demand curves indicate that more recreation will be needed in the future, that people are becoming more aware of the fact that resources foregone (e.g., wilderness) may be gone for the foreseeable future, that timber may be needed but that technology and experience of foresters can be invoked to provide the timber without irreparably damaging the scenic quality of the forests, etc. FS intent is to manage the use of renewable resources so that consumptive goods will be provided in perpetuity while minimizing/mitigating adverse effects on wilderness, recreation experience, wildlife habitat, etc.
- . Concept implies a desire to maintain a balance between man's activities and stability of fragile ecosystems -- i.e., one does not take precedence over the other if renewable resources are in fact to be managed to supply a continuing output in perpetuity, i.e. of all purposes: outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, wildlife and fish; establishment and maintenance of wilderness areas.
- . Concept recognizes that the state-of-the-art in landscape architecture, wildlife management, etc. has reached the point where expertise from such specialists can be invoked to play a partnership role with timber and range experts in order to provide resource outputs while maintaining the integrity of the environment.

##### B. Key Values and MU-SY

1. Section 2: "In the administration of the NFs due consideration shall be given to the relative values of the various resources in particular areas."
  - . Relative: "resulting from or depending on relation; comparative: a relative truth".

- . While all of the resources are in general of equal value, the relative values of the various resources on particular or localized areas are ascertained by considering the public in a broad sense as well as the comparative value of a particular use in one locale vis-a-vis another.
  - . In Region 2, the resources (i.e., mountains, lakes, grasslands, wilderness, unique scenic beauty) can be managed for various uses. The planning dilemma is to ascertain the value of timber in Region 2, for example, compared to its value in another Region; to ascertain the value of scenic beauty in the Rockies compared to another region, etc. In ascertaining this comparable or relative value it is necessary to consider the qualitative assessment of value as expressed by the public at large, the quantitative assessment of value as determined by comparing the economic efficiency of providing a resource output in one area versus another, the qualitative/quantitative assessment of foreclosing the opportunity for a particular use(s) in an area, etc.
  - . E.G., How many Federal \$ need to be invested in Region 2 versus Region X in order to provide Y\$ in income to the Federal Treasury? The State Treasury? The local Treasury? How many acres of wilderness can be provided in Region 2 versus Region X? How will foreclosing an opportunity to use NF trees for timber due to a wilderness designation affect the rural character of the area? The local economy? Community stability? Can the community impact be mitigated?
2. Section 3: "In the effectuation of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with interested State and local governmental agencies and others in the development and management of the National forests."
- . "and others": i.e., private sector, local citizens, public interest groups -- area level planning is a mechanism for responding to "others" and for reflecting the values of a broad range of interest groups in FS management plans. Intent is to secure cooperation among various groups by issuing management directions which (1) acknowledge that from a comparative viewpoint the use of a particular resource is more valuable in one area than in another (e.g., use of forest for wilderness use versus timber); (2) acknowledge that the local economy is dependent on a particular use (e.g., range) while nationally the public desire may be for a conflicting use (e.g., recreation); (3) indicate directions which FS personnel should follow in day to day decisions in order to accommodate the local desires within a larger framework of managing NFS land for the benefit of the public at large.

3. Section 4: "management of all the various renewable surface resources...so that they are utilized in the combination that will best meet the needs of the American people;..."

- . Suggests that in total the NFS outputs meet the aggregate needs of public at large -- does not mean that each resource must be used the same in each area/region...KV is a way to provide emphasis on certain resource uses in one area while KV will change from area to area.

"...making the most judicious use of the land for some or all of these resources or related services over areas large enough to provide sufficient latitude for period adjustments in use to conform to changing needs and conditions."

- . KVs are criteria which can be used to guide a plan in order to accomodate changing needs and conditions.

EG -- SRU where economic base was primarily agriculture in the past but where changing times are driving people away from small farm and livestock operations. KV of recreation, for example, can be used to guide the diversification of the economic base.

"...that some land will be used for less than all of the resources;"

- . KV guides the FS in assessing land capability to most efficiently provide one or more resource outputs.

EG-- one area may be more highly prized for recreation than another. Although with sufficient investment it may be possible to make the less desirable area attractive for recreation, the expenditure of the Federal \$ would not be as efficient.

"...and harmonious and coordinated management of the various resources, each with the other, without impairment of the land, with consideration being given to the relative values of the various resources, and not necessarily the combination of uses that will give the greatest dollar return or the greatest unit output."

- . KV help in ascertaining relative value, including value of intangibles such as wilderness experience. At the same time, the lack of a \$ constraint implies that the FS can give assistance to local economies but that in giving that assistance the relative value of unique resources (e.g. beauty of the Rocky Mountains) be emphasized.

C. Application of Key Value Emphasis in Multiple Use Planning:  
Three Illustrations

Objective: To show how the key value concept has been (will be) used in formulating management strategies for securing resource outputs from NFS lands in Region 2, to illustrate how conflicts resulting from changing public values have been (will be) resolved, and to pictorially and verbally represent the implications of business-as-usual versus management in view of key values.

- . Select three real situations where key values have been (will be) applied (i.e. either intentionally or by implication) to resolve conflict, meet changing public demands while protecting environmental quality, etc. Possibilities are discussed below.

- . Example #1: Rampart Range Management Plan for Motorcycles (obtain from G.S.).

- Conflict between motorcycles and traditional uses.
- Traditional response to ban motorcycles would not solve problem but would move it elsewhere.
- Use of trail bikes represent changing recreational values by segment of population.
- Without a plan, damage to wildlife habitat, water quality, developed recreation, dispersed recreation such as horse-back riding, etc. would ensue.
- Show how plan responds to key values of scenic beauty, wildlife, multiple opportunities for dispersed recreation.

- . Example #2: Black Hills.

- Illustrate how timber and forage can be productive while managed to provide recreation and scenic beauty. (Note: Some response indicated that people thought the Black Hills had been ruined by FS activities so this may not be a good example.)
- Obtain information from G.S. and Jim Hagemeyer if this example is to be developed.

- . Hypothetical Example: Managing for Dispersed Recreation

Objective: To illustrate the type of management activities the FS intends to take in dealing with the four-wheel drive issue while simultaneously protecting scenic and wildlife values.

- . Set up conflict between those who want more access to public land vis a vis four-wheel drive and those who want to protect intrinsic values of the land. Describe changing socio-economic conditions.
- . Describe a particular forest and an SRU whose population is impacting adversely on that forest due to increased demands for four-wheel drive.
  - Visual aspects of forest (photographs of "virgin" forest and land eroded by overuse of four-wheel drive)
  - Show danger in not planning to protect scenic values.
- . How will relative value of forest for one use vis a vis another use be determined? (Or relative value of one area in forest versus another)
  - Does forest provide unique habitat for wildlife species? Which species?
  - What does forest look like? Diversity of tree types?
  - Do streams provide fishing opportunities?
  - What is prevailing water quality in streams?
  - Are hunting opportunities provided by forest?
  - What is traditional use of forest (i.e. what type of dispersed recreation)?
  - What is legal mandate of FS in planning for forest? NEPA, Wildlife Protection, etc? (fill in etc.)
  - What is responsibility as land stewards? (e.g. MU-SY "without impairment of the land")
- . Findings: Forest is habitat to unique species. Mosaic of tree stands are visually beautiful due to sound timber management practices. Hunting for elk is excellent. Water quality in streams is high. Traditional uses of forest are for hunting/fishing. Plans to provide dispersed recreation must account for economic, social and environmental costs/benefits according to NEPA and other legislation. Access to forested lands via temporary roads (some closed but still used) threatens elk herds by frequent intrusion, water quality due to erosion of roads close to stream beds, and fish habitat due to deteriorating water quality.

Environmental value of forest for fish and wildlife, and for scenic beauty is threatened. Social values are changing due to immigration of people who value four-wheel drives more than hunting and fishing. Economic value of driving is estimated at \$        while that of fishing is \$        and hunting \$        From a national perspective, the visual beauty and wildlife habitat aspects of the Forest are unique and therefore their value relative to other forests is high.

. How will FS manage for KV and desire for dispersed recreation?

- What are the best vegetative cover and tree stands to provide habitat for wildlife? For elk?
- What should the mosaic cover look like to continue to provide for scenic beauty?
- What fish species should be featured?
- What level of water quality is needed to provide the proper environment for those species?
- Which temporary roads are adversely affecting stream quality? Disrupting elk habitat?
- Which temporary roads can be used with little or no impact on stream quality? Wildlife habitat?
- Which temporary roads are visually attractive and which are unattractive?

. Answers to the above questions should point to specific management activities:

- Silviculture
- Road closure or maintenance
- Vegetative treatment to enhance wildlife
- etc.

. Figures 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 -- Photographs showing without-a-plan-condition mounted beside photographs showing with-a-plan-emphasizing-key values-condition. (Will need FS assistance)

. Note: The above illustrations will need to draw heavily on FS expertise, data, etc. in order to make them realistic.



Above outline is considered tentative and subject to modification after receiving further input from FS personnel who are yet to be identified.

D. Implications of the Concept for Future Planning

Objective: To discuss how the concept as a management tool can be used to address conflict, take advantage of resource capability for outputs while simultaneously avoiding litigation, and provide direction for more efficient plan formulation and evaluation.

- . Discussion will be derived on basis of examples given in the previous section.

## Chapter V

### AN INTERIM RESPONSE TO PUBLIC CONCERNS

#### A. Plans as Depicted in Preliminary Area Guides

- . What levels of resource outputs are depicted in the AGs?
- . What tradeoffs are implied?

#### B. Interim Changes in Area Guides

- . What changes can be attributed to typographical errors?
- . What changes can be attributed to improved data?
- . What is the timeframe for finalizing AGs?

#### C. The Regional Forester Answers the Public

- . How will the RARE II effort effect recommendations for wilderness in the final versions of the AGs?
- . How will the Region use key values in multiple use management of public lands?
- . Are local industries threatened by AG plans?
- . How will the FS resolve conflicts between grazing and recreation?
- . Will FS land management goals conflict with National energy goals?
- . Etc.

## V. An Interim Response to Public Concerns

Objective: To indicate changes that have been made in preliminary AGs, and the direction that will be followed in finalizing the AGs.

### A. Plans As Depicted in Preliminary Area Guides

- Tables V-1, V-2 and V-3 -- Tabular display by resource elements of objectives and tradeoffs. See Sample Table V-1. Will need assistance from FS in deriving tradeoffs; those illustrated are intended to initiate discussion.

### B. Interim Changes in Preliminary Area Guides

- Tables V-4, V-5, V-6 -- Tabular display of changes resulting from typographical errors, improved data, etc. Format: use left side of Table V-1 showing resource elements and objectives; strike over error and insert correct number (i.e. display both original number and corrected number).

### C. The Regional Forester Answers the Public

- Unresolved concerns will be addressed and specific questions will be formulated. The answers to these questions will indicate how the FS intends to respond to issues such as:
  - Area Guide recommendations for wilderness.
  - Area Guide direction to FS personnel re: energy/mineral development in RARE II lands, in study areas, and in areas recommended for wilderness designation.
  - FS commitment to local industries; i.e. specifically what it means.
  - Strategies conceived to resolve grazing-recreation conflicts, timber-recreation conflicts, 4 wheel drive-wilderness enthusiast conflicts, etc.
  - FS intent regarding specific objectives not addressed in AGs; e.g. archeology, rock hounding, water quality management.
  - Examples of management strategies which enhance key values and promote multiple use.
- Note: The above is not intended to be all inclusive. List will be revised after receiving additional analysis of input data from G.S.; subsequent iterations will be needed with FS to further refine the interview questions.

EXAMPLE

Table V-1

SUMMARY OF MULTIPLE USE PLANS AND TRADEOFFS IN SRMA

Outdoor Recreation

. Developed Recreation	- Increase FS developed site capacity by 1,100 - 1,200 PAOT by 1995	Possible feeling of crowding versus not meeting demand or utilizing sites to full capability
	- Increase annual developed capacity from 5,088,000 RVDs to 7,100,000 by 1995	Potential environmental damage in site specific facilities versus unmanageable numbers of visitors due to population growth and attendant demand increases
. Dispersed Recreation: Motorized	- Increase annual motorized recreation opportunities from 4,462,000 RVDs to 6,229,000 RVDs by 2020	Potential adverse impacts on air quality, noise nuisance in site specific areas, disruption of wildlife habitat versus unmanaged and unplanned use of administrative roads and trails by 4-wheel drives, dirt bikes, etc.
. Dispersed Recreation: Nonmotorized	- Increase annual nonmotorized recreation opportunities from 2,193,000 RVDs to 4,570,000 RVDs by 2020	Potential conflicts between recreationists and grazing, adverse environmental impacts in site specific camping areas versus allowing conflict between motorized-nonmotorized recreationists to grow, nonmanagement of back country areas
. Driving for Pleasure		
Etc.	Etc.	Etc.

NOTE: Would need FS input to derive tradeoffs; those shown are intended to stimulate discussion on whether or not such a table could be derived

- . An alternative to the above is to list all issue adds by area, summarize how the issue is being addressed in the interim, and indicate "probable" outcome in terms of final AG. (There will be both winners and losers with respect to every issue and no attempt should be made to hide the facts -- e.g. about wilderness recommendations, managing for key values, etc.)